FEB 15 1958

Memorandum to BSR Associates and

to all other interested persons -

The following paragraphs are a transcript of part of a page from CLIPS, QUOTES, & COMMENTS - a bi-weekly Release of the Borderland Sciences Research Associates, and supplementary to the bi-monthly ROUND ROBIN.* The purpose of enclosing this single page is to draw attention to the 'cosmological illustration' of the action of the aeroforms given in the last paragraph. It is, of course, an illustration only, but in my opinion worthy of close attention and reflection, on its own merits, and without prejudice pro or contra on the score of its origin in the communications of the Yada di Shi'ite.

(Meade Layne, Director BSR)

This was a very brilliant light and it blinked as though it was expanding and contracting, without going out. There was a bright clear light in the center rimmed by a red light around the edge.These things just can't be described unless you see them. But this is what I think is important: there have been two seen in the daytime over the same place, about 16 miles west of Lompases, Texas. My brother-in-law, who was born and raised near this place, told me that the exact spot where the saucers had been seen was different in some way - and that lightning was always striking there... Geologists have investigated that part of the State for years as there are peculiar rock formations, also evidence that prehistoric animals have lived there...

(1647 Highland Blvd., San Antonio, Tex.)

(The Mark P. Controls have recently explained - AGAIN - that many landings in isolated places, and such acts as dipping up water (as at Brush Creek), or taking soil or rock, are for sampling purposes - the space people are studying the internal and surface conditions of the planet, which are undergoing rapid and somewhat ominous changes... We thank Assoc. Nell Bonton for the 'lead'. Repeated landings or close sightings at the same place should be carefully noted.- and reported.)

Probably the best help in thinking the operations of the aeroforms is the illustration given by the Yada: the importance of this is such that we shall probably repeat it many times: There is no flight across space in the sense of traversing interstellar distances in any kind of 'material' craft (as we understand the word material). Consider a 'nest' of concentric balls, one within another. Any point on either surface of any ball will have corresponding points on the surfaces of all the other balls. Any object or condition can emerge from its surface onto the surface of any other ball. These surfaces correspond to space-time frames of reference. In this illustration, assume there is no space between the concentric balls. If no space, no time is required for "crossing" it. The transition is effected by converting the energy rates (changing the vibration) of the etheric substance involved. Whenever these energy rates fall within the range of our senses, we are able to see, hear, and touch the etheric object - which then becomes matter as we commonly think of it. Etheric matter by reason of its density is susceptible of control by mental energy (thought). The withdrawal, gradual or sudden, of an aeroform (from sight) is often (not always) due to a reconversion of energy - a kind of "dematerialization". These basic concepts probably apply to the entire range of aeroform phenomena.

*C.Q.C., 6 mo., $5.00 - R.R., 1 yr. $5.00

November 27, 1953

"WHERE IS THE PROOF"

This is a correspondence-saver memo - and I hope no one will take offense at it. We are jammed with work, and handicapped by lack of funds and office help.

Many people who are at long last beginning to awaken to the phenomena of the aeroforms, write us asking for "proof" that the "Saucers" are "real", or that our explanation of them is correct.

It would help a great deal if each inquirer would define what he means by proof, and just what kind of evidence would constitute proof to him.

"Proof"means one thing in formal logic, something else in mathematics, a third something in chemistry, a fourth something in law. The dictionary defines proof as evidence sufficient to convince beyond reasonable doubt. This is the legalistic definition, and leaves open the questions What is evidence, when is it sufficient, and when is a doubt 'reasonable'? Proof is cumulative under this concept. We use the word proof in this sense except where otherwise indicated.

As to the actuality of the aeroforms (Discs, etc.,) any doubt about this can arise only from ignorance of the data - thousands of sightings, in all parts of the world, and thousands of printed pages about them, a half dozen books and endless newspaper and magazine articles. This question is not worth answering, except by each person for himself.

Evidence of a different nature was published by us years ago, when fallen meteallic fragments were analyzed at the University of Chicago. The material was not of a kind known to us in combination, though the separate metals were familiar.

Many accounts of close-up firsthand observation of landed or hovering Discs have been printed. We cannot keep on summarizing this material.

No one can conduct you personally to a landed Disc - if that is what you mean by proof.

The November, 1952, issue of TRUE magazine printed a long article on the radar evidence of the Discs - which should be sufficient to allay lingering doubts. But we discarded all controversy on this point in the Fall of 1946, and certainly do not think it worth while to reopen it. Even governmental authorities and many "experts" have ceased to argue this point. The Air Force openly accepts about 20% of sightings as factual, though not yet explainable.

Concerning the etheric explanation -- We have printed hundreds of pages on this, and have a short summary available on request, without cost. At present I only point out

1. This interpretation meets all the demands of all the varied phenomena.
2. It was advanced by us (we did not originate it) in 1946, and there is nothing in the whole mass of subsequent data which invalidates it.
3. No other explanation has been offered anywhere which meets the demands of the whole of the phenomena - or which is worth the paper it has been written on.
4. It is good science and sound metaphysics - though the science admittedly runs into super-physics and may not have the sanction of the text-books.
5. It includes the long historical series of similar phenomena, of which there is abundant evidence - which we can NOT summarize daily for newcomers to the subject.

The "etheric theory" thus stands firmly rooted and alone in its field. If at first you can make nothing of it, we can only say: examine the whole subject carefully and form your own conclusions. Do not ask us to do all the thinking for you, or to repeat facts and arguments indefinitely. We offer an explanation but have no personal interest in your acceptance. -- Have patience and time will resolve the issue.

M.L.